arXiv:1404.0871v1 [math.MG] 3 Apr 2014

BANG'S PROBLEM AND SYMPLECTIC INVARIANTS

ARSENIY AKOPYAN*, ROMAN KARASEV†, AND FEDOR PETROV**

Abstract. We consider the Tarski–Bang problem about covering by planks and show that the symplectic techniques may be useful in this problem. We are able to handle some particular cases with the symplectic techniques, and show that the general cases would follow from a certain "subadditivity conjecture" in symplectic geometry. We also prove several related results by more elementary methods.

1. Introduction

We start from recalling the classical problem attributed to Alfred Tarski and Thøger Bang and the known results on this problem, in particular those of Keith Ball, that give motivation to the whole discussion in this text.

The earliest version of this problem appeared when Tarski studied [28, 29] certain degree of equivalence $\tau(x)$ of a unit square Q and a rectangle P of size $x \times \frac{1}{x}$, defined as the smallest number of parts one has to cut the rectangle into to assemble the square from the parts. To solve a particular case of this problem and show that $\tau(n) = n$ for natural numbers n, Henryk Moese [23] inscribed a disk K into Q and noticed that this disk cannot be covered by less than n parts P_i of P. The solution used the trick of projecting the sphere in $\mathbb{R}^3$ onto K and counting the areas of the preimages of P_i on the sphere. By the way, this gave the solution of what was called later "the Bang problem" for the round disk K and the Euclidean norm.

Bang had [10] a different (non-volumetric) solution of the more general problem: If a convex body $K \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is covered by planks $P_1, \dots, P_m$ (a plank is a set bounded by a pair of parallel hyperplanes) then the sum of Euclidean widths of the planks is at least the Euclidean width of K. After that, Bang conjectured [10] that whenever a convex body K is covered by planks $P_1, \dots, P_m$, the sum of relative widths of the planks is at least 1. Here the relative width is the width of P_i in the norm with the unit ball $K - K$ (the symmetrization of K), and this version would certainly imply the original result of Bang.

The best to date result on Bang's conjecture belongs to Ball [7], who established it for all centrally symmetric convex bodies K. For non-symmetric bodies the problem remains open.

There is essentially one general approach to Bang's problem known so far, designed by Bang himself. For any plank P_i we take an orthogonal (in a fixed Euclidean metric) segment I_i such that $|I_i|$ is slightly more than the width $w(P_i)$. The first easy step is to show that the Minkowski sum $I_1 + \dots + I_m$ can be translated to fit into any given convex body of minimal width 1; and the main lemma of Bang asserts that at least one point of this Minkowski sum $I_1 + \dots + I_m$ is not covered by P_i. The proof is given by optimizing a cleverly chosen quadratic function of m variables. This lemma immediately proves the

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 52C17, 37J15, 37D50, 53D35.

Key words and phrases. the Bang problem, billiards, symplectic capacity.

*Supported by the Dynasty foundation and the President's of Russian Federation grant MK-3138.2014.1.

†Supported by the Dynasty Foundation.

**Supported by the President's of Russian Federation grant MK-6133.2013.1.

Euclidean case of Bang's problem and is also used in Ball's proof of the general symmetric case. In [9] Ball proved another version of this problem for complex vector spaces, which we also discuss in Section 4.

In contrast to the general case, the approach of Moese to the cases of dimension 2 and 3 is volumetric. The crucial observation is that for a plank P_i the area of its intersection with the round two-sphere $S^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is proportional to the plank width. It is also known that the volumetric approach fails in larger dimensions.

In this paper we are going to propose another "quantitative" approach to the Bang conjecture based on certain invariants of symplectic manifolds and Hamiltonian systems, introduced by Hofer and Zehnder (see their nice book [19]), with first nontrivial examples given previously by Gromov [17]. This approach has already proved to be useful in a series of works [5, 6, 3], and allows either to solve a problem in convex geometry by symplectic methods or provides a good intuition to pose the "right questions" in convex geometry.

Even for the known results by Ball [7, 9] such a new approach would be useful, because Ball's proofs are very long and technical. However, here we are only able to handle these results in a particular case of "almost parallel planks", the general case being dependent on some conjectured property of symplectic capacities.

Acknowledgments. The authors thank Yaron Ostrover for useful discussions and numerous remarks, Wacław Marzantowicz and Jakub Byszewski for scanning the old Polish papers [23, 28, 29] for us.

2. Symplectic invariants

Let us try to relate the Bang conjecture to some notions of symplectic geometry. Denote by V the ambient vector space of the convex body K, and let V^* be its dual. Consider some norm $\|\cdot\|$ on V. Let $\|\cdot\|_*$ be the dual norm on V^*, with the unit ball B°. In the Bang conjecture the natural choice of the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is the norm with the unit ball $K-K$ (the Minkowski sum of K with its centrally symmetric image), but we do not restrict ourselves and allow arbitrary norms here.

We always assume that the norms $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_*$ are sufficiently smooth. For the Bang conjecture this is not a problem, since the conjecture allows going to the limit. We also assume that K has sufficiently smooth boundary when this is needed in the argument.

Our idea is to start from a covering of K by planks $P_1, \dots, P_m$ with widths $w_1, \dots, w_m$ (measured in the norm $\|\cdot\|$) and show that a certain symplectic invariant of a certain subset of $V \times V^*$ is bounded in terms of $\sum_i w_i$.

First of all, the space $V \times V^*$ is, in more general terms, the cotangent space of the manifold V. The cotangent space always inherits the canonical symplectic structure, which in this particular case is given by the formula

$$\omega((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) = \langle x_1, y_2\rangle - \langle x_2, y_1\rangle.$$

Now we are going to consider the set $K \times B^\circ \subset V \times V^*$, which is a sort of a unit disk bundle over K. Now we want to bound the *displacement energy* of $K \times B^\circ$. The definition of the displacement energy operates with a time dependent Hamiltonian $H(x, y, t)$ on $V \times V^* \times [T_1, T_2]$, whose *total oscillation* is defined to be

$$\|H\| = \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \sup_{x,y} H(x, y, t) - \inf_{x,y} H(x, y, t)\, dt,$$

see [19, Ch. 5] or [26] for the detailed definitions. Sometimes the segment $[T_1, T_2]$ is normalized to be $[0, 1]$, but actually this and the following definitions do not depend on

this normalization. It is always possible to scale the time segment by α and multiply the Hamiltonian by $1/\alpha$ without changing the result of the Hamiltonian flow.

The *displacement energy* of $K \times B^\circ$, denoted by $e(K \times B^\circ)$, is, roughly speaking, the minimal $\|H\|$ such that the corresponding time dependent Hamiltonian flow φ_t takes $K \times B^\circ$ off itself, that is

$$(K \times B^\circ) \cap \varphi_{T_2}(K \times B^\circ) = \emptyset.$$

Again, more details can be found in [19, Ch. 5].

The following conjecture would give an approach to the Bang type problems:

Conjecture 2.1. *If K can be covered with a finite set of planks with the sum of relative widths equal to w then $e(K \times B^\circ) \leq 2w$.*

Bang's conjecture would follow if we also estimate the value $e(K \times B^\circ)$ from below, in the particular case when $B = K - K$. But the truth is that this does not work fully, see Section 3 for more details.

We cannot prove this conjecture so far, but we sketch an argument for a particular case of it.

Theorem 2.2. *The previous conjecture holds if the $\|\cdot\|_*$-unit normals $n_i \in V^*$ of the planks can be chosen so that for every nonnegative coefficients c_i, at least one of which is 1 the inequality holds:*

$$\left\| \sum_i c_i n_i \right\|_* \geq 1. \tag{2.1}$$

Let us call the assumption *almost parallel planks*. In the Euclidean case this is guaranteed by a simpler assumption that $(n_i, n_j) \geq 0$ for any pair of indices.

Proof. Let a plank P_i have width w_i. Consider the Hamiltonian $H_i(x, y, t)$ defined for $t \in [2i - 2, 2i]$ so that H_i is independent of t and y, equals zero for x on one side of P, equals w_i for x on the other side of P_i, and changes linearly in x inside P_i. The effect of the corresponding (discontinuous!) flow is as follows: $(x, y) \in V \times V^*$ remains fixed if x is outside P_i and gets shifted by $(0, 2n_i)$, where $n_i = d_x H_i$ is the unit normal to P_i, for x inside P_i. From the definition it follows that the part $(K \cap P_i) \times B^\circ$ gets shifted outside $K \times B^\circ$, spending the total oscillation $2w_i$.

The idea is to shift this way everything outside $K \times B^\circ$ in a sequence of such steps for all planks P_i. The total oscillation of such a sequence of Hamiltonians is therefore twice the sum of widths. To make this idea work we need some care. First, the function $H_i(x, y, t)$ is not smooth in x and therefore the Hamiltonian flow is discontinuous. This could be remedied by a certain smoothening changing the value of dH in a small neighborhood of $\partial P_i \times V^*$; but after that we have to keep in mind that some parts near boundaries of planks are "incompletely shifted". A more serious problem, is that we have made several shifts and it usually happens that something, previously shifted outside $K \times B^\circ$, returns inside $K \times B^\circ$ on a subsequent shift. It is easy to check that nothing returns back under the assumption (2.1); and in this case the proof passes. □

Remark 2.3. Here we observe a strange phenomenon. The classical method of Bang works better when the planks are far from parallel, see [8] for an impressive example. But the displacement energy approach presented above likes the opposite situation, when the planks are almost parallel.

Remark 2.4. Yaron Ostrover has noted in the private communication that the proof of the above theorem does not use the convexity of K. This may be useful, though lower bounds for the symplectic invariants of $K \times B^\circ$ seem less accessible for non-convex K.

It is well known that the Hofer–Zehnder symplectic capacity $c_{HZ}(U)$ (see the definition and discussion in [19]) gives a lower bound for the displacement energy of U, where U is an open bounded set in $V \times V^*$. So the following version of the conjecture would also be sufficient for many purposes:

Conjecture 2.5. *If K can be covered with a finite set of planks with the sum of relative widths equal to w then $c_{HZ}(K \times B^\circ) \le 2w$.*

3. Billiards and capacity

Assuming Conjecture 2.5, in order to solve the Bang problem it remains to prove that $c_{HZ}(K \times B^\circ) \ge 2$, where B° is the polar to $K - K$. Fortunately, the paper [5] provides a nice elementary description of this capacity (all the bodies are assumed to be sufficiently smooth):

Theorem 3.1 (Artstein-Avidan, Ostrover, 2011)**.** *The Hofer–Zehnder capacity of $K \times B^\circ$ is equal to the length of the shortest closed billiard trajectory in K, where the length is measured in the norm $\|\cdot\|$ and the reflection rule reflects the momentum coordinate from one point on ∂B° to the other point on ∂B° by combining it with a multiple of the normal to ∂K at the hit point.*

Remark 3.2. In [5] closed geodesics of ∂K were also considered as a particular case of a billiard trajectory, with length measured with $\|\cdot\|$ norm. But in [2] it was shown that such closed trajectories can never be shorter than the ordinary bouncing trajectories.

So Conjecture 2.5 (or 2.1) would imply the following claim: If for a smooth strictly convex body K there are no closed billiard trajectories in K with $\|\cdot\|$-length less than 2 then the Bang conjecture holds for K. It is easy to verify the assumption when K is the Euclidean ball of unit diameter and $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean norm. But the following example is unpleasant in view of the general Bang conjecture:

Example 3.3. If K is the triangle in the plane, then the small triangle formed by its midpoints of sides is a closed billiard trajectory and has relative length 3/2. The triangle is not smooth, but it can be smoothened without increasing the number 3/2 too much. Thus the billiard approach is *not sufficient* to establish the Bang conjecture already in this simple case.

Moreover, for the Euclidean norm, the triangle of unit width has a billiard trajectory along the midpoints of length $\sqrt{3}$. So the billiard approach fails even for the known case of the Bang theorem, which estimates the sum of Euclidean widths of the covering planks by the *minimal width* of K.

Of course, if we plan to apply the symplectic methods to the Bang problem and similar questions, then it is crucial to have some lower bounds for the length of a closed billiard trajectory (or a closed geodesic on the boundary) in a given convex body. One lower bound for the billiard trajectory in a unit ball of a norm was established in [6]:

Theorem 3.4 (Artstein-Avidan, Karasev, Ostrover, 2013)**.** *Let $\|\cdot\|$ be a smooth norm and let its dual $\|\cdot\|_*$ be also smooth. Then any closed billiard trajectory in the unit ball B, being measured with $\|\cdot\|$, has length at least* 4.

Evidently, the segment $[x, -x] \in B$, where $\|x\| = 1$, passed forth and back is a closed billiard trajectory of length 4 in the norm associated with B. Theorem 3.4 asserts that this is the shortest one, and together with Conjecture 2.5 (or some other similar conjecture) would imply Ball's theorem from [7] about the Bang problem for centrally symmetric case. Clearly, this result together with Theorem 2.2 already gives a symplectic proof for the

particular case of Ball's theorem, when the "almost parallel planks" assumption in (2.1) is imposed.

For possibly not-symmetric convex bodies a similar result was established in [2] (in this theorem we allow a norm to violate the reflexivity property $\|x\| = \|-x\|$):

Theorem 3.5 (Akopyan, Balitskiy, Karasev, Sharipova, 2014)**.** *Let $\|\cdot\|$ be a smooth non-symmetric norm in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let its dual $\|\cdot\|_*$ be also smooth. Then any closed billiard trajectory in the unit ball K, measured with $\|\cdot\|$, has length at least $2 + 2/n$.*

See also [2] for the discussion of its relation to the non-symmetric case of Mahler's problem.

Now we prove one more estimate related to the non-symmetric case of Bang's problem. It resembles the previous one but does not seem to be equivalent.

Theorem 3.6. *Let K be a smooth strictly convex body in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Consider the norm with the unit ball $B = K - K$, then any closed billiard trajectory in K with this norm has length at least $1 + \frac{1}{n}$.*

Remark 3.7. This estimate is obviously tight for $n = 1, 2$, and is actually tight for $n \geq 3$, as it was checked by Yoav Nir [24, Ch. 4]. In fact, a closed polygonal line with vertices at the centers of facets of a simplex K is a closed billiard trajectory in K with respect to the norm with unit ball $K - K$.

Remark 3.8. Assuming something like Conjecture 2.5 this theorem would imply a weaker result than the Bang conjecture, that is the sum of relative widths of planks would be proved to be at least $\frac{n+1}{2n}$. This is not what was conjectured by Bang, but would be a good step toward the Bang conjecture. Again, for "almost parallel planks", like in Theorem 2.2, this weaker Bang conjecture with sum $\frac{n+1}{2n}$ already follows from Theorems 2.2 and 3.6.

Remark 3.9. Following [6] and assuming the Viterbo conjecture [32] (volume of a convex $X \subset V \times V^*$ is at least $\frac{c_{HZ}(X)^n}{n!}$), this theorem would also imply a Mahler-type inequality:

$$\operatorname{vol} K \cdot \operatorname{vol}(K - K)^\circ \geq \frac{\left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n}{n!}.$$

This kind of Mahler inequality has not been considered so far, in particular one may try to resolve its two-dimensional case by more elementary methods. As in [2], this inequality may happen not to be tight; intuitively in it is explained by the observation that an equality case in Viterbo's inequality needs many closed characteristics of the same action (billiard trajectories in our setting), which are not present in the example of a triangle.

Proof of Theorem 3.6. By [2, Theorem 2.1] the shortest closed billiard trajectory in K has at most $n + 1$ bounce points $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and cannot be covered by a smaller positive homothet of K. By Lemma 5.5 we have:

$$\sum_{i=2}^{m} \|q_i - q_{i-1}\| \geq 1.$$

If L is the length of the closed polygonal line $q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_m, q_1$ then the above inequality is a lower bound for L minus the length of the segment $[q_m, q_1]$. The same argument applies to any other segment, and since some of them has length at least $\frac{L}{n+1}$ (remember that $m \leq n + 1$) then

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{n+1}\right) L \geq 1,$$

that is $L \geq \frac{n+1}{n}$. □

As a more elementary example of this activity, we want to mention another result, implicit in [11]:

Theorem 3.10 (D. Bezdek, K. Bezdek., 2009)**.** *For a convex body K of constant width* 1 *in the plane with the Euclidean norm, any shortest closed billiard trajectory has length* 2 *and must be a diameter of K passed twice.*

As was noted by Alexey Balitskiy (private communication), the proof of [11, Theorem 1.2] proves this assertion as well. Example 3.3 shows that it cannot be generalized to arbitrary norm without additional assumptions. Also, the generalization of Theorem 3.10 for the Euclidean norm in dimensions more than 2 is open.

4. Covering by symplectic cylinders

In [9] Keith Ball established another result similar to the Bang problem: When the unit ball in $\mathbb{C}^n$ is covered by unitary cylinders Z_i of radii r_i then $\sum_i r_i^2 \geq 1$. Here $\mathbb{C}^n$ is endowed with some Hermitian metric and a unitary cylinder of radius r is an r-neighborhood of a complex hyperplane.

This result seems even more suitable for the application of symplectic methods, because $\mathbb{C}^n$ itself has the symplectic structure corresponding to the Hermitian metric, and the unitary cylinders Z_i are symplectic cylinders with $c_{HZ}(Z_i) = e(Z_i) = \pi r_i^2$. So we are forced to state a more general conjecture, that would also imply Conjecture 2.5.

Definition 4.1. For a convex body $S \subset \mathbb{C}$ call $Z = S \times \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, and all its images under symplectic transformations, a *symplectic cylinder* with cross-section S.

It is relatively clear that, for such more general symplectic cylinders, the invariants $c_{HZ}(Z) = e(Z)$ equal the area of S. Now goes the conjecture:

Conjecture 4.2. *If a convex body $K \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is covered by a finite set of symplectic cylinders $\{Z_i\}$ then*

$$c_{HZ}(K) \leq \sum_i c_{HZ}(Z_i).$$

Ball's theorem would follow from this conjecture because for the unit ball B the capacity is $c_{HZ}(B) = \pi$. Conjecture 2.5 would follow as well, because for every plank P_i the set $P_i \times B^\circ$ can be included into a symplectic cylinder of capacity at most $2w(P_i)$.

This theorem looks like the *subadditivity* property of the Hofer–Zehnder capacity: The capacity of the union is at most the sum of capacities. We defer the more detailed discussion of possible subadditivity to Section 8, where we show that in general it is not feasible to expect a subadditivity when we allow non-convex sets and give some other examples related to the question.

5. Inequalities between the oscillation and the norm of the differential

In this section we consider more problems resembling the Bang problem. It seems unrelated, but some techniques used here will also be useful in the next section. First, we start with an elementary particular case (see also [15, P. 113]):

Theorem 5.1. *Let F be a C^1-smooth function on the unit ball B of a norm $\|\cdot\|$. Then*

$$\max_{x\in B} F(x) - \min_{x\in B} F(x) \geq 2 \min_{x\in B} \|dF(x)\|_*,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_*$ is the corresponding dual norm.

Proof. By the standard approximation argument we assume the norms $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_*$ to be smooth and strictly convex. We also assume F to be infinitely smooth. For any x consider the unique unit vector $y(x)$ such that

$$\langle dF(x), y(x)\rangle = \|dF(x)\|_*.$$

Under the above assumptions this vector depends smoothly on x and we can consider the differential equation:

$$\dot{x} = y(x).$$

Moreover, we consider its solution with the initial condition $x(0) = 0$. Since this solution has the unit velocity it cannot get outside B in a period of time less that 1. Hence it is defined for $t \in (-1, 1)$. Then we calculate

$$\frac{d}{dt}F(x(t)) = \langle dF(x), \dot{x}\rangle = \langle dF(x), y(x)\rangle = \|dF(x)\|_*.$$

The value $F(x(t))$ definitely increases with t and if we put $m = \min_{x\in B}\|dF(x)\|_*$ then $\frac{d}{dt}F(x(t)) \geq m$, and therefore $F(x(t))$ increases by at least $2m$ on $(-1, 1)$. □

The symplectic approach allows to relate this type of inequalities to billiards:

Theorem 5.2. *Let F be a C^1-smooth function on a convex body K, and let us measure everything with a norm $\|\cdot\|$. If the shortest billiard trajectory in K has length ξ, then*

$$\max_{x\in K} F(x) - \min_{x\in K} F(x) \geq \xi/2 \cdot \min_{x\in K}\|dF(x)\|_*.$$

Proof. Note that by Theorem 3.1 the Hofer–Zehnder capacity $c_{HZ}(K \times B^\circ) = \xi$. Now consider F as a Hamiltonian on $K \times V^*$ (where $V \supset K$ is the ambient space) and observe that its gradient flow has velocity $dF(x)$ in the direction of V^*, hence it shifts $K \times B^\circ$ off itself in time $\frac{2}{\min_{x\in K}\|dF(x)\|_*}$. So the total displacement energy of K is

$$e(K \times B^\circ) \leq \frac{2}{\min_{x\in K}\|dF(x)\|_*}\left(\max_{x\in K} F(x) - \min_{x\in K} F(x)\right)$$

and the result follows from the inequality $e(\cdot) \geq c_{HZ}(\cdot)$ and the description of $c_{HZ}(K\times B^\circ)$ in terms of billiards. □

The usage of Theorem 5.2 is complicated by the fact that it is not always easy to estimate the minimal length of a closed billiard trajectory from below. Finally, it turns out that the following strengthening of Theorem 5.2 can be proved without any symplectic techniques:

Theorem 5.3. *Let F be a C^1-smooth function on a convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $\|\cdot\|$ be the norm with unit ball $K + (-K)$. Then*

$$\max_{x\in K} F(x) - \min_{x\in K} F(x) \geq \min_{x\in K}\|dF(x)\|_*,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_*$ is the corresponding dual norm.

Remark 5.4. This is indeed a strengthening of Theorem 5.2, because K always possesses many $\|\cdot\|$-billiard trajectories (the affine diameters of K) with $\|\cdot\|$-length 2.

The proof is based on the following lemma:

Lemma 5.5. *Let K and $\|\cdot\|$ be as in Theorem 5.3. If $C \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a connected graph with total $\|\cdot\|$-length h, then C can be covered by a translate of the homothet hK.*

Proof of the Lemma. We may assume that C has straight line segments as edges. For an edge $[a, b]$ the inequality

$$\|a - b\| \leq \delta$$

just means that $[a, b]$ can be covered with a translate of δK. So we cover all edges of C (that is the whole C) by translates $\delta_1 K + t_1, \dots, \delta_m K + t_m$ with

$$\delta_1 + \delta_2 + \dots + \delta_m \leq h.$$

Then we observe that if two sets $\delta_i K + t_i$ and $\delta_j K + t_j$ intersect then they can be covered by a single set $(\delta_i + \delta_j)K + t'$. Using the connectedness of C we can repeat this step several times to cover the whole C with a translate of $(\delta_1 + \dots + \delta_m)K$. □

Proof of Theorem 5.3. We try to argue similarly to the proof of Theorem 5.1. Extend the gradient vector field to the whole $\mathbb{R}^n$ somehow and observe that assigning a trajectory of this vector field to a point $x \in K$ gives a continuous map φ from K to a topological space of covering dimension at most $n - 1$. By [22, Theorem 6.2] (essentially proved in [1, 27], see also [30, Proposition 1, pp. 84–85, and Theorem 1, p. 268]) there exists a connected subset $C \subseteq K$ that is mapped by φ to a single point and that cannot be covered by a smaller homothet of K.

This set C is actually a trajectory of the gradient flow, because it is mapped to a single point by φ. If the $\|\cdot\|$-length of the trajectory C is at least 1 then we are done by integrating over this trajectory. Otherwise Lemma 5.5 asserts that C can be covered with a smaller homothet of K, which is a contradiction. □

Observe that by the way we have proved the following result resembling Gromov's waist of the sphere theorem [18]:

Theorem 5.6. *Assume a convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is mapped by a continuous map f to a topological space Y with covering dimension less than n. Then for some $y \in Y$ the total length of $f^{-1}(y)$ in the norm with unit ball $K - K$ is at least* 1.

Proof. By the standard technique we may represent f as a composition of two maps

$$X \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} \tilde{Y} \xrightarrow{\pi} Y$$

with π having discrete fibers and $\tilde{f}$ having connected fibers. Then we apply [22, Theorem 6.2] and find $\tilde{y} \in \tilde{Y}$ such that $C = \tilde{f}^{-1}(\tilde{y})$ (which is a connected component of a fiber of f) cannot be covered by a smaller homothet of Y. By Lemma 5.5 this C has total length at least 1 in the corresponding norm. □

Remark 5.7. It is curious that the proof of Theorem 5.1 works in infinite dimensional Banach spaces (for decent functions f), while the above argument to prove Theorem 5.3 is essentially finite dimensional. So its extension to infinite dimensional Banach spaces is not so clear at the moment.

6. Two directions of planks

In this section we prove a particular case of Bang's problem with elementary methods. It is independent of the other parts of this paper, but we thought it makes sense to confirm another particular case of the conjecture. One may check that it does not follow from the result under the "almost parallel" assumption.

Theorem 6.1. *Let a convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be covered by a family of planks $P_1, \dots, P_m$, whose normals have only two distinct directions. Then the sum of widths of the planks in the norm with the unit ball $K - K$ is at least* 1*, that is the Bang conjecture holds in this case.*

Proof. If all the planks are parallel to each other then the assertion is evidently true. Assume there are two distinct normals $n_1, n_2 \in V^*$ (we put $V = \mathbb{R}^n$). Obviously, the projection

$$\pi : V \to \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \pi(x) = (n_1(x), n_2(x))$$

reduces the problem to the following planar case: The projection (denote it by K again) is inscribed in the unit square $abcd$ (let a be the left bottom and b be left top), that is K contains the points on every side of $abcd$. Let those points be p, q, r, s ($p \in ad$, $q \in ab$, $r \in bc$, $s \in cd$), we allow some of the to coincide. Assume K to be covered by a set of horizontal and vertical planks with sum of widths (now widths can be considered Euclidean) less than 1. Also choose such a covering with the minimal number of planks.

If there are only two planks then the result is well known, see [25] or [12, Lemma 10.1.1]. So we assume that there are k vertical planks and at least k horizontal planks (we interchange the axes if needed).

Consider the points of K not covered with the vertical planks, they split into $k+1$ convex sets $M_1 \cup M_2 \cup \cdots \cup M_{k+1}$ ordered from left to right, we allow some of them to be empty. These sets have to be covered with horizontal planks and this reduces to cover their projection to the $0y$ axis with a set of segments. Definitely, one needs at most $k+1$ segments to cover those projections, and we now that k segments are really needed. Now consider the cases:

(1) The set $M_1 \ni q$ is nonempty and its projection to $0y$ has no intersection with the projections of other M_i's. Then one horizontal plank is needed to cover M_1 separately from the other parts. But it makes sense to replace this plank with a vertical one, indeed, the set M_1 contains the triangle qc_1d_1 homothetic to qcd, whose vertical and horizontal widths coincide. Therefore the vertical width of M_1 is at least its horizontal width. So we replace the horizontal plank of M_1 with a vertical one and merge this vertical plank with the first vertical plank in the list. After that the sum of widths does not increase and the number of planks does decrease.
(2) The case when the projection of $M_{k+1} \ni s$ to $0y$ does not intersect the other projections of M_i's is considered similarly.
(3) The set M_1 is empty and M_{k+1} is also empty. Then the projections of M_i's to $0y$ can be covered with $k-1$ segments, but we have assumed that the number of segments is at least k.
(4) $M_1 = \emptyset$, M_{k+1} is not empty and its projection to $0y$ intersects some of the projections of other M_i's. Again, in this case at most $k-1$ horizontal planks are sufficient.
(5) Similar to the previous case, when we interchange M_1 and M_{k+1}.
(6) Both the projections of $M_1 \ni q$ and $M_{k+1} \ni s$ to $0y$ are nonempty and both of them intersect other M_i's. Again, we know that we really need at least k horizontal planks to cover M_i's. This may only happen when the projections of M_1 and M_{k+1} do intersect and the projections of M_i's with $2 \le i \le k$ are disjoint from them and are disjoint from each other. Therefore a horizontal plank P_h cover both M_1 and M_{k+1}. Hence $P_h \ni q, s$. Other sets $M_2, \ldots, M_k$ then have to be disjoint from P_h and the total number of needed horizontal planks is precisely k.

    Interchanging the vertical and horizontal direction we find a vertical stripe $P_v \ni p, r$. The segment qs intersects the boundary of P_v at q_1, s_1, lying in their respective M_i, M_{i+1}. But then M_i and M_{i+1} intersect P_h, which is a contradiction.

□

7. Fractional Bang-type results

7.1. **Linear programming considerations and covering by Euclidean cylinders.** A *fractional Bang theorem* would be a result showing that if a convex body K is covered by a family of planks so that every point of K is covered at least k times, then the sum of widths is at least Wk for some constant W. Another equivalent statement would be to consider weighted planks covering any point in K with sum of weights at least one and deduce that the weighed sum of widths is at least W. Here width can be measured with any norm. The usual linear programming argument with the Farkas lemma shows that this kind of results is equivalent to an estimate $w(P) \geq W\mu(P \cap K)$ for an appropriately chosen probability measure μ on K.

This technique is hard to apply for arbitrary bodies and norms, so we concentrate on the case of the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and its unit ball B^n. For $n \geq 3$ we take μ to be the normalized surface area on ∂B^n, then the constant W_n is easily calculated:

$$W_n = \int_{-1}^{1} (1-x^2)^{\frac{n-3}{2}}\, dx = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)},$$

which is of order $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}$ for large n (and equals 2 for $n = 3$ as expected). Actually, this constant cannot be improved, as the following argument shows. Take a sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ and consider a set of N random centrally symmetric planks of width δ. Each such plank covers

$$\frac{\int_{-\delta/2}^{\delta/2}(1-x^2)^{\frac{n-3}{2}}\, dx}{\int_{-1}^{1}(1-x^2)^{\frac{n-3}{2}}\, dx}$$

of the surface area, which is close to δ/W_n for small δ. Then the sum of widths is δN and the expected covering multiplicity is approximately $\delta N/W_n$. Then some kind of central limit theorem shows that the minimal covering multiplicity can get sufficiently close to $\delta N/W_n$ thus showing that W_n is tight.

A similar argument with the uniform measure on ∂B^n is applicable when we want to fractionally cover the Euclidean unit ball B^n with m-dimensional Euclidean cylinders, that is sets congruent to $Z = X \times \mathbb{R}^m$, where X is an $(n-m)$-dimensional convex body. We denote by $\sigma_{n-m}(Z) = \mathrm{vol}_{n-m} X$ the $(n-m)$-dimensional cross-section of Z. Assuming $m \geq 2$, for a weighted covering of B^n with m-dimensional Euclidean cylinders $Z_1, \ldots, Z_N$ and weights $t_1, \ldots, t_N$, we obtain:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} t_i \sigma_{n-m}(Z_i) \geq \frac{n\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2+1)} \frac{\Gamma(m/2)}{2\pi^{m/2}} = \frac{\pi^{\frac{n-m}{2}}\Gamma(m/2)}{\Gamma(n/2)}.$$

The right hand side is the ratio of the total measure of ∂B^n and the maximum density of the projection of this standard measure on ∂B^n to $\mathbb{R}^{n-m}$. The latter density is given by (as the reader can check by elementary integration):

$$\rho_m(x) = \frac{2\pi^{m/2}}{\Gamma(m/2)}(1-|x|^2)^{m/2-1}.$$

From this formula it is clear that the argument only works for $m \geq 2$ and moreover, for $m = 2$ it gives the precise estimate for the *non-fractional* covering by 2-dimensional Euclidean cylinders like in the original proof of Moese, that is:

Theorem 7.1. *If the Euclidean unit ball is covered by 2-dimensional Euclidean cylinders $Z_1, \dots, Z_N$ then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sigma_{n-2}(Z_i) \geq \mathrm{vol}_{n-2}(B^{n-2}) = \frac{\pi^{n/2-1}}{\Gamma(n/2)}.$$

This result is an extension of [14, Theorem 3.1] in case of covering the ball from $m = 1$ to $m = 2$, and the case $m = n - 1$ is a particular case of the Bang theorem.

In [20] Vladimir Kadets showed the following. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a covering of the Hilbert space by Hilbert cylinders Z_i similar to $B \times H$, where B is a 3-dimensional ball, such that $\sum_i \sigma(Z_i) < \varepsilon$. Here σ denotes the 3-dimensional cross-section. In [13] Károly Bezdek was mistaken to think that from Kadets' construction it follows that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists sufficiently large n such that the unit ball B^n can be covered by $(n-3)$-cylinders Z_i with sum of their cross-section less than $\mathrm{vol}(B^3)$. Actually it does not follow from Kadets' construction, which was essentially based on infinite-dimensional properties of the Hilbert space. So [13, Problem 3.5] can be restated in the following natural form:

Conjecture 7.2. *If the Euclidean unit ball B^n is covered by m-dimensional Euclidean cylinders $Z_1, \dots, Z_N$ then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sigma_{n-m}(Z_i) \geq \mathrm{vol}_{n-m}(B^{n-m}) = \frac{\pi^{(n-m)/2}}{\Gamma((n-m)/2+1)}.$$

7.2. **Fractional covering by almost parallel planks.** Now, in addition to the above elementary considerations, we prove a result about covering of a Euclidean ball using symplectic methods. Informally, it shows that the constant W from the above discussion gets closer to 2 when the planks are "almost parallel":

Theorem 7.3. *Let $\{P_i\}$ be a family of planks, covering every point of the Euclidean ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ at least k times. Assume also that the normals to the planks n_i may be oriented so that for every $i \neq j$, $(n_i, n_j) \geq c$, where $c \geq 0$ is a constant. Then*

$$\sum_i w(P_i) \geq 2\sqrt{(c(k-1)+1)k}.$$

Proof. For every P_i we consider the function F_i with $dF_i = n_i$ on P_i and $dF_i = 0$ outside P_i. These functions are not smooth but the following argument remains valid after a suitable smoothening of every F_i.

Then we consider the sum $F(x) = \sum_i F_i(x)$. The assumption $(n_i, n_j) \geq c$ implies that $|dF(x)| \geq \sqrt{(c(k-1)+1)k}$. Then using the displacement energy of $B \times B$ as in the proof of Theorem 2.2, or using Theorem 5.1 below, we obtain:

$$\max_B F(x) - \min_B F(x) \geq 2\sqrt{(c(k-1)+1)k}.$$

But the difference of every summand F_i is at most $w(P_i)$, and the result follows. □

Remark 7.4. From the above discussion it follows that there must be a direct proof of this theorem by construction of an appropriate probability measure μ on B with the property

$$w(P) \geq 2\sqrt{(c(k-1)+1)k}\mu(P \cap B).$$

How is it constructed?

8. Subadditivity of capacities: Does it exist?

8.1. **Bad examples.** In this section we discuss possible subadditivity properties of a symplectic capacity in more detail. First, we provide examples, which would show the absence of subadditivity of capacities for non-convex sets. We are going to consider any capacity $c(\cdot)$ defined with an action selector, as described in [16]. It is known that any such capacity is between the Hofer–Zehnder capacity $c_{HZ}(X)$ and the displacement energy $e(X)$.

Example 8.1. The first example is very simple. Let B be a unit disc in the plane an let S_- and S_+ be the halves of its boundary. If we thicken S_- and S_+ slightly, their capacities still remain very close to zero. But their union has at least the same capacity as B itself, which is π.

In the preceding example the union was topologically nontrivial, so we provide an example which does not differ topologically from the case of convex sets.

Example 8.2. In the notation of Section 2, let B be the unit ball in the Euclidean $\mathbb{R}^n$ with its dual also B. Then the set $X = (B \setminus rB) \times B$ has displacement energy at most $2(1-r)$, the Hamiltonian

$$H(x) = \begin{cases} 1-r, & \|x\| \le r \\ 1-\|x\|, & r \le \|x\| \le 1 \\ 0, & \|x\| \ge 1 \end{cases}$$

does the job after certain smoothening, because its gradient has norm is at least 1 over the base $B \setminus rB$ of X, which is sufficient to displace the ball bundle over this base constituting the set X. Hence the capacity if this set is also at most $2-2r$. The other part $Y = rB \times B$ obviously has displacement energy and any capacity at most $4r$. In total we have at most $2+2r$ for $c(X)+c(Y)$, but the union set $X \cup Y = B \times B$ has $c(B \times B) \ge 4$, according to Theorem 3.1. Here the set X was topologically nontrivial, but we can easily remove a cylinder of radius r, passing from the origin to the boundary of B from X, and add this cylinder to Y, without increasing the capacity of Y by Theorem 3.1.

Moreover, it is possible to widen this cylinder from the origin when moving towards the boundary of B, thus making the set X starshaped.

The given example concludes that no action selector capacity is subadditive when all the sets are convex and one set is allowed to be startshaped. Maybe the convexity of the sets may help to prove the subadditivity; that is, the most general subadditivity conjecture in this text looks like:

Conjecture 8.3. *If a convex body $K \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is covered by a finite set of convex bodies $\{K_i\}$ then, for some symplectic capacity,*

$$\sum_i c(K_i) \ge c(K).$$

Note that in [4, Theorem 1.4] an extremal characterization of the Hofer–Zehnder capacity allowed to prove the Brunn–Minkowski type inequality $c_{HZ}(K+L)^{1/2} \ge c_{HZ}(K)^{1/2} + c_{HZ}(L)^{1/2}$ (here sum is the Minkowski sum) for convex bodies. So far it is not clear if those methods can be used to prove something about the union of convex bodies.

8.2. **Decomposing Hamiltonian symplectomorphisms.** In fact, subadditivity may not fold for capacities, but a sort of subadditivity does hold for some action selectors, like

that in [31], see the general discussion in [16]. For example, in [31, Proposition 4.4] it is shown that

$$c_+(\varphi\psi) \le c_+(\varphi) + c_+(\psi)$$

for a certain action selector c_+ of a compactly supported Hamiltonian symplectomorphisms, defined in [31] through the generating function of the symplectomorphism. An action selector is a function of a Hamiltonian symplectomorphism with compact support that selects some of the actions of its fixed points and have certain other properties, listed in [16]. Any action selector, and c_+ in particular, gives rise to a symplectic capacity $c_V(U)$ for open bounded subsets $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, defined in [31, Definition 4.11] as

$$c_V(U) = \sup\{c_+(\varphi) : \operatorname{supp}\varphi \subset U\}.$$

Now, in order to have a subadditivity for c_V it were sufficient to have a claim like this: For two bounded open subsets $U, V \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ and a Hamiltonian symplectomorphism τ supported in $U \cup V$, there exist two Hamiltonian symplectomorphisms φ and ψ with supports in U and V respectively such that $\tau = \varphi \circ \psi$. *Unfortunately*, this claim cannot be true, since any τ taking a point from $U \setminus V$ to $V \setminus U$ cannot be decomposed this way. Moreover, already in the plane we can consider U and V as unions of several disjoint squares obtained from $Q_0 = (-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon) \times (-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon)$ by translations $(m, 0)$, with m odd for U and even for V. If $U \cup V$ is connected and consists of $2N$ copies of Q_0, then an appropriately chosen diffeomorphism of it evidently cannot be decomposed in less than $2N$ diffeomorphisms supported in either U or V. Of course this latter example does not apply to connected sets.

If one wants to utilize this decomposition approach somehow, some extra properties like the convexity of K in Conjecture 8.3 must be used. For example, we might want to bound $c_{HZ}(K)$ in the left hand side and note that this number is achieved for convex K at very special time-independent Hamiltonians, which might turn out to be decomposable.

8.3. **Cutting a ball into two convex pieces.** In [33, Theorem 2.2] an opposite inequality for the Hofer–Zehnder capacity was proved in a particular case using pseudo-holomorphic curves: If two disjoint convex bodies K_1 and K_2 are contained in a ball B then

$$c(K_1) + c(K_2) \le c(B).$$

This statement together with Conjecture 8.3 would imply that for any hyperplane cut of a ball into two parts K_1 and K_2 the equality $c_{HZ}(K_1) + c_{HZ}(K_2) = c_{HZ}(B)$ holds. Let us show that this is indeed the case:

Claim 8.4. *If a ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ is cut by a hyperplane into pieces K_1 and K_2 then*

$$c_{HZ}(K_1) + c_{HZ}(K_2) = c_{HZ}(B).$$

Proof. Assume that the radius of B is 1 and identify $\mathbb{R}^{2n} = \mathbb{C}^n$. Using the transitivity of the $\mathrm{U}(n)$ action on ∂B assume that the cutting hyperplane is $H = \{\operatorname{Re} z_1 = \cos\tau_0\}$.

Let us use the description of the Hofer–Zehnder capacity of convex bodies in terms of the minimal action of a closed characteristic on the boundary. Obviously, the closed characteristic $(e^{it}, 0, \dots, 0) \subset \partial B$ is broken by H into two closed characteristics of K_1 and K_2 respectively, and their actions sum up to $c_{HZ}(B) = \pi$. It remains to show that other closed characteristics on ∂K_1 or ∂K_2 have larger actions.

Assume a closed characteristic for $K_1 = \{\operatorname{Re} z_1 \ge \cos\tau_0\}$ starts at a point $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ such that $\operatorname{Re} z_1 = \cos\tau_0$ and $\operatorname{Im} z_1 < 0$. Put $z_1 = \rho e^{-i\tau}$. We must have $\rho \le 1$ and if $\rho = 1$ then this closed characteristic is the one already considered. So we assume $\rho < 1$.

Let us check how this point evolves along a characteristic on ∂K_1. First, it moves along ∂B as $(\rho e^{i(-\tau+t)}, z_2 e^{it}, \dots, z_n e^{it})$ for $t \in [0, 2\tau]$. Then it moves in H along the direction of

$\operatorname{Im} z_1$ getting from $(\rho e^{i\tau}, z_2 e^{2i\tau}, \ldots, z_n e^{2i\tau})$ to $(\rho e^{-i\tau}, z_2 e^{2i\tau}, \ldots, z_n e^{2i\tau})$. Then everything is repeated. In order for this point to get to its original position we must have

$$\tau = \pi \frac{k}{m}.$$

Then the total number of turns will be m and the action will be:

$$A = k\left(\rho^2(\tau - \sin\tau\cos\tau) + \pi(1-\rho^2)\right),$$

What remains to show is the inequality:

$$\rho^2(\tau - \sin\tau\cos\tau) + \pi(1-\rho^2) \geq \tau_0 - \sin\tau_0\cos\tau_0.$$

Note that $x - \sin x \cos x$ increases on $[0, \pi]$ from 0 to π. In the case $\tau, \tau_1 \geq \pi/2$ we have

$$\rho^2(\tau - \sin\tau\cos\tau) + \pi(1-\rho^2) \geq \tau - \sin\tau\cos\tau \geq \tau_0 - \sin\tau_0\cos\tau_0,$$

because from $\rho\cos\tau = \cos\tau_0$ it follows that $\tau \geq \tau_0$ when they both are greater than $\pi/2$.

In the remaining case $\tau \leq \tau_0 \leq \pi/2$ we substitute $\rho\cos\tau = \cos\tau_0$ and we have to prove the inequality

$$\cos^2\tau_0(\tau - \sin\tau\cos\tau - \pi) + \pi \geq \cos^2\tau(\tau_0 - \sin\tau_0\cos\tau_0).$$

In the considered range the LHS is increasing and the RHS is decreasing in τ, hence it remains to consider the case $\tau = 0$, when the inequality is

$$\pi - \pi\cos^2\tau_0 \geq \tau_0 - \sin\tau_0\cos\tau_0.$$

Putting $x = 2\tau_0 \in (0, \pi)$ and using the trigonometric identities we have to prove

$$\pi(1 - \cos x) \geq x - \sin x,$$

the latter is true since for $x \geq \pi/2$ the LHS is at least π and the RHS is at most π, while for $x \in [0, \pi/2]$ the inequality is true since it holds for $x = 0$ and after taking the derivative is becomes $\pi\sin x \geq 1 - \cos x$, which is obviously true for $x \in [0, \pi/2]$. □

References

[1] A.M. Abramov. Sets with identical Aleksandrov diameters. *Moscow Univ. Math. Bull.*, 27:6 (1972), 80–81.

[2] A.V. Akopyan, A.M. Balitskiy, R.N. Karasev, A.V. Sharipova. Elementary results in non-reflexive Finsler billiards. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1401.0442* (2014).

[3] J.-C. Álvarez Paiva, F. Balacheff, K. Tzanev. Isosystolic inequalities for optical hypersurfaces. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1308.5522* (2013).

[4] S. Artstein-Avidan, Y. Ostrover. A Brunn–Minkowski inequality for symplectic capacities of convex domains. *International Mathematics Research Notices* (2008); also available at arXiv:0712.2631.

[5] S. Artstein-Avidan, Y. Ostrover. Bounds for Minkowski billiard trajectories in convex bodies. *International Mathematics Research Notices* (2012); also available at arXiv:1111.2353.

[6] S. Artstein-Avidan, R. Karasev, Y. Ostrover. From symplectic measurements to the Mahler conjecture. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1303.4197* (2013).

[7] K. Ball. The plank problem for symmetric bodies. *Invent. Math.* 104:3 (1991), 535–543.

[8] K. Ball. A lower bound for the optimal density of lattice packings. *International Mathematics Research Notices* 10 (1992), 217–221.

[9] K. Ball. The complex plank problem. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society* 33:04 (2001), 433–442.

[10] T. Bang. A solution of the "plank problem". *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 2 (1951), 990–993.

[11] D. Bezdek, K. Bezdek. Shortest billiard trajectories. *Geometriae Dedicata* 141 (2009), 197–206.

[12] K. Bezdek. *Classical Topics in Discrete Geometry.* Available online at ucalgary.ca (2010).

[13] K. Bezdek. Tarski's plank problem revisited. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:0903.4637* (2009); to appear in Bolyai Soc. Math. Studies, Intuitive Geometry.

[14] K. Bezdek, A.E. Litvak. Covering convex bodies by cylinders and lattice points by flats. *Journal of Geometric Analysis* 19:2 (2009), 233–243.

[15] F.H. Clarke, Y.S. Ledyaev, R.J. Stern, P.R. Wolenski. *Nonsmooth analysis and control theory.* Springer, 1998.
[16] U. Frauenfelder, V. Ginzburg, F. Schlenk. Energy capacity inequalities via an action selector. *Geometry, Spectral Theory, Groups, and Dynamics. Contemporary Mathematics* 387, (2005), 129–152.
[17] M. Gromov. Pseudo holomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds. *Inventiones Mathematicae* 82:2 (1985), 307–347.
[18] M. Gromov. Isoperimetry of waists and concentration of maps. *Geometric and Functional Analysis* 13 (2003), 178–215.
[19] H. Hofer, E. Zehnder. *Symplectic invariants and Hamiltonian dynamics.* Birkhäuser, 1994.
[20] V. Kadets. Weak cluster points of a sequence and coverings by cylinders. *Mat. Fiz. Anal. Geom.* 11:2 (2004), 161–168.
[21] V. Kadets. Coverings by convex bodies and inscribed balls. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 133:5 (2005), 1491–1495.
[22] R.N. Karasev. A topological central point theorem. *Topology and its Applications* 159:3 (2012), 864–868.
[23] H. Moese. Przyczynek do problemu A. Tarskiego: "O stopniu równoważności wielokątów". (English: A contribution to the problem of A. Tarski "On the degree of equivalence of polygons") *Parametr* 2 (1932), 305–309.
[24] Y. Nir. On closed characteristics and billiards in convex bodies. *M. Sc. Thesis.* Tel Aviv University, 2013.
[25] D. Ohmann. Kurzer Beweis einer Abschätzung für die Breite bei Überdeckung durch konvexe Körper. *Archiv der Mathematik* 8:2 (1957), 150–152.
[26] L. Polterovich. *The geometry of the group of symplectic diffeomorphism.* Birkhäuser, 2001.
[27] K. Sitnikov. Über die Rundheit der Kugel. *Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen Math.-Phys. Kl. IIa* (1958), 213–215.
[28] A. Tarski. O stopniu równoważności wielokątów. (English: On the degree of equivalence of polygons) *Młody Matematyk* 1 (1931), 37–44.
[29] A. Tarski. Uwagi o stopniu równoważności wielokątów. (English: Remarks on the degree of equivalence of polygons) *Parametr* 2 (1932), 310–314.
[30] V.M. Tikhomirov. *Some questions of the approximation theory.* (In Russian). Moscow, MSU, 1976.
[31] C. Viterbo. Symplectic topology as the geometry of generating functions. *Mathematische Annalen* 292 (1992), 685–710.
[32] C. Viterbo. Metric and isoperimetric problems in symplectic geometry. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 13:2 (2000), 411–431.
[33] K. Zehmisch. The codisc radius capacity. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1210.2378* (2012).

Arseniy Akopyan, Dept. of Mathematics, Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Institutskiy per. 9, Dolgoprudny, Russia 141700

Arseniy Akopyan, Institute for Information Transmission Problems RAS, Bolshoy Karetny per. 19, Moscow, Russia 127994
E-mail address: akopjan@gmail.com

Roman Karasev, Dept. of Mathematics, Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Institutskiy per. 9, Dolgoprudny, Russia 141700

Roman Karasev, Institute for Information Transmission Problems RAS, Bolshoy Karetny per. 19, Moscow, Russia 127994
E-mail address: r_n_karasev@mail.ru
URL: http://www.rkarasev.ru/en/

Fedor Petrov, Saint-Petersburg Dept. of the Steklov Mathematical Institute, nab. Fontanki 27, Saint-Petersburg, Russia 191023
E-mail address: fedyapetrov@gmail.com